

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement set forth in the June 6, 2006 Office Action, Applicant provisionally elects for prosecution with traverse, species III and claims 6-8 and 13-15 readable thereon.

As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 806.04(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.141, a reasonable number of species may be claimed in one application. Here, three species over 16 claims cannot be deemed an unreasonable amount of species presented in a patent application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the requirement to restrict the application is respectfully requested.

Further, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 803, if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though the application contains claims to independent or distinct inventions.

While the computer systems and methods recited in claims 1-16 may be distinct for the reasons set forth by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that simultaneous examination will not present an undue burden, much less any burden. For example, each of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 13 and 16 includes recitations related to comparison of endian information.

Under such circumstances, the Examiner is encouraged to maintain all claims in the same application (See M.P.E.P. § 803).

COMMENTS ON SUBSTANCE OF MAY 31, 2006 INTERVIEW

The undersigned notes that no conclusion as to the appropriateness of the Restriction Requirement was stated during the May 31, 2006 Interview. Applicants' representative pointed out to the Examiner that he was not authorized to make an oral election and that he would not make any representations that would potentially limit the claims.

An early and favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888